

(Continued from Page 1)

Secretary of Commerce has the use of a large and increasing revolving fund that continues without time limit and can be spent without Congressional action.

Over the next five years this program will acquire between 1.1 and 1.4 billion dollars, plus repayments from the old Area Redevelopment Administration.

However, as the history of federal programs shows, these funds are only a starter. Huge additional appropriations are almost inevitable if local areas demand "their share."

The Economic Development Act has so many provisions considered dangerous and dubious that to list them without providing a look at the Act itself is to invite disbelief. For complete reprint of the wording of the entire Act send 20 cents to Freedom Press, Box 64217, Los Angeles, Calif.

To assist the reader the following analysis is given with the references to specific portions of the Act.

With a growing revolving fund independent of Congressional appropriations and the expansion of areas and activities determined solely by Presidential appointees, the mechanism has been established for a bureaucratic control system that can reward or punish with its economic operations. 201 (a), 202 (a) (1), 202 (b) (2), 203.

Federal administrators control the granting of monies for public works and development facilities to governmental units or non-profit organizations or associations which can be said to represent an area. 101 (a). Opponents charge that the term "development facilities," which is nowhere included in the act, includes items such as golf courses.

The applicant for a loan must be approved by a local government where the project is located. 202 (b) (2). However, the local governmental agency is under pressure to conform with administration wishes in that the redevelopment area may be terminated by the Secretary of Commerce at any time after annual review. 402. Also any decision by a regional commission can be vetoed by the federal co-chairman. 502 (c).

Public funds can also be used for such activities as a propaganda network and to buy support from foundations and political action groups. Under the guise of "research," "planning," "training," and the like, the federal administrators under this program are free to support opinion-moulding organizations and vote-delivering organizations. 301 (a) (b).

It is possible that a new Banking System is being set up as well as a business empire. The Secretary of Commerce has the power to buy and sell securities and property, guarantee loans, and make loans. 202 (a) 701 (4), (5), (6), (8). A windfall to large lending institutions tied in with political action groups is possible under the guarantee provision.

Urban renewal programs can be financed with less local approval necessary. 202 (a).

Covert disarmament can be brought about by diverting funds from military preparedness to this program. 301 (c), 501 (7), 701 (3).

The Act applies to Puerto Rico, which already has its operation bootstrap which consists of exemption from federal taxes and tariff-free entry into the United States. 706.

As a means of insuring favorable votes in Congress, every state is guaranteed at least one redevelopment area regardless of the prosperity of the State. 401 (d).

State and local governments are coerced to enter into regional planning agencies in order to get the long-term planning approval necessary for applications for grants and loans. 202 (b), (10).

Previous programs of the same general nature are extended indefinitely under the directions of the Secretary. 715.

The Secretary's authority to designate economic development regions can be justified by such subjective factors as "the area

is adversely affected by changing industrial technology." 501 (6).

There are a number of supposedly reassuring phrases in the Act, which upon examination turn out to be applicable or effective only if an opinion or finding of the Secretary or a Cabinet member honors them.

1—No competition with business or money lending institutions. 201 (a) (2), 201 (d), 202 (g) (4).

2—No "pirating" of industry by areas being developed. 202.

3—No subsidizing of competition by loaning money below market rates. 201 (b), 202 (b) (8).

4—Local authorities have a "reasonable opportunity to review and comment on proposed projects. 201 (e).

5—Annual review and annual report to Congress. 402, 509, 707.

6—A National Advisory Committee to be appointed. 602.

Longtime observers of the political scene concede that the Act can be fought at the local level provided citizens not only understand the one-man rule it establishes but also the alternatives available.

It is not generally understood that various actions of the federal government are producing the very problems of depressed areas and impoverished local governments that the federal government is offering to solve through the Economic Development Act.

Conversely, there are a number of things that the federal government could cease doing that would, to a large extent, solve the same problems as the Act purports to do. Here are a few that have appeared in published discussions:

The federal government could cease taxing its citizens to subsidize foreign economies and foreign competition.

The federal government could cease its practice of giving special tax benefits to industries running away to foreign countries, with the consequent loss of jobs here.

The federal government could cease selling surplus agricultural products to foreign manufacturers at prices below the cost to domestic manufacturers.

The federal government could cease taking away from local areas tax money that local areas could collect if the federal tax were removed.

The federal government could cease to impose rules on local welfare programs that screen waste and fraud from public view.

For these reasons opponents do not believe the Act to be a necessary answer for every area with an unemployment problem.

One constitutional authority and historian offered the following comment as a summary of the problem.

"Can we ever safely forget that while local political dictatorship in the United States can always be fought from the sanctuary of another city or another state, a National political dictatorship will be able to keep its opposition beaten down?

"And can we ever forget that the usual path to dictatorship is to create problems, then offer to solve them in return for a grant of absolute power?

Common Sense.

UNION, NEW JERSEY, U.S.A.

	U. S. CANADA	CANADA FOREIGN
1ST CLASS	2ND CLASS	
1 year -----	\$5.00	\$3.00
2 years -----	8.00	5.00
3 years -----	10.00	7.00
Lifetime -----	—	50.00

Foreign 1st Class — \$10.00 per year

BULK COPIES — SAME or ASSORTED

20 copies -----	\$1.00
100 copies -----	4.00
500 copies -----	15.00
1000 copies -----	20.00

Published twice monthly except July and August,
once each, by

CHRISTIAN EDUCATIONAL ASSN.
530 Chestnut Street, Union, N. J. 07083

BE ALERT!

FACTS: At Dublin, New Hampshire 2 to 6 October, 1965, the United World Federalists held conference. They came up with the "2nd Dublin Declaration" which states "as a basis for discussion" among world government proponents, the United Nations as the best instrument through which to establish World Government. The declaration proposes:

- Universal and complete disarmament, subject to effective inspection.
- An adequate World Police Force composed of individuals, not national contingents.
- Universal membership, world citizenship; no member allowed to withdraw.
- World legislative body with an executive and a judicial branch.
- Reliable world revenue to support the organization.
- Safeguards against interference in domestic affairs of member nations.
- Adoption of the Charter by a "preponderance of all nations and peoples."

SIGNIFICANCE: For 20 years the World Federalists have been denouncing the United Nations as "inadequate for World Federalism." This declaration means that a solid international front has been put together which will make even stronger efforts to get Congress to change our Constitution and the United Nations Charter. At this 20th anniversary of the U.N., we have seen it is ready to collapse. Mr. Goldberg, with U.S. tax payer's money, had to bail it out by paying the dues of nations who would not, including the U.S.S.R. and France. This power group now hopes to keep it alive until they can create a stronger, monolithic, anti-Christian dictatorship, based on force. An important question: Who is going to enforce world law? The U.N. voting patterns show clearly it will be the Communists.

In this connection, it is significant that the following legislation, following Senate Con. Resolution No. 32 and House Con. Resolution No. 384, is under consideration before the Congress.

- General and Complete Disarmament.
- An International Disarmament Organization.
- Permanent World Peace Force.
- World Court With Power to settle International Disputes.
- Financing Arrangements to Support Peace-Keeping Machinery.

It is no coincidence that the Congress has before it the identical legislation wanted by the "Dublin Resolution". Prominent in its support are James P. Warburg, Marion McVitty, Grenville Clark, Norman Thomas, etc, all liberal one-worlders and their various organizations.

The purpose is made even more clear when you examine a proposed amendment to the United Nations Participating Act (S 1903). This would give the Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at the N.Y. headquarters of the U.N. (Mr. Goldberg) the right to assign representatives for the USA to the U.N. conferences on nuclear energy and disarmament.

ACTION INDICATED: (1) By every means available arouse public opinion to ensure the defeat of Senate Bill 1903; to keep the Connally Amendment as the only safeguard against complete surrender of American Sovereignty, to make it clear to your representatives in Congress that you will vote them out of office if they dare surrender our sovereignty, which they have no power under the Constitution to do.

(2) See that your senators and representatives get copies of this Alert.

(3) In addition to spreading this Alert by the chain letter method, do all you can by telephone and personal conversation to form hard core resistance groups to fight against this treasonable scheme.

(4) Demand the proper punishment for traitors who are guilty of this attempt to surrender us into the hands of our enemies.

P. A. Del VALLE, President
DEFENDERS OF
THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION, INC.